Remarks

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,182,227 of *Blair et al.* ("*Blair*").

The Examiner has objected to the drawings because reference character 52 is used to designate both a service and a service handler. In response, Applicant submits herewith replacement drawings (4 replacement sheets) that correct the use of reference characters 50 and 52 and provide consistency in appearance among the drawings.

Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by *Blair* because Blair does not disclose the limitations of amended claim 1. Amended claim 1 recites a device that includes a service and that further includes a service handler that receives an email message that specifies an access function pertaining to the service and that performs the access function in response to an email message.

Blair does not disclose a service handler that performs an access function to a service in response to an email message that specifies the access function as claimed in amended claim 1. Instead, *Blair* discloses performing an access function to a service in response to an HTTP command that specifies the access function. (*Blair*, col. 1, lines 11-25 and col. 3, line 65 through col. 4, line 5).

In further contrast, *Blair* discloses a server that sends an email message to a contact who authorizes an HTTP access to a service (See the Abstract of *Blair*) rather than perform an access function to a service in response to an email message that specifies the access function as claimed in amended claim 1.

Given that claims 2-6 depend from amended claim 1, it is submitted that claims 2-6 are not anticipated by *Blair*.

It is also submitted that amended claim 7 is not

- 6 -

anticipated by *Blair*. Amended claim 7 includes a computing element that accesses a service through a firewall by transferring an email message to a service handler such that the email message specifies an access function pertaining to a service. *Blair* does not disclose transferring an email message to a service handler such that the email message specifies an access function pertaining to a service. Instead, *Blair* discloses transferring an HTTP command that specifies the access function to a service (*Blair*, col. 1, lines 11-25 and col. 3, line 65 through col. 4, line 5) and sending an email message to a contact who authorizes the HTTP access to the service (See the Abstract of *Blair*).

Given that claims 8-13 depend from amended claim 7, it is submitted that claims 8-13 are not anticipated by *Blair*.

It is also submitted that amended claim 14 is not anticipated by *Blair*. Amended claim 14 includes limitations similar to the limitations of amended claim 1 including transferring an email message to a device via a network such that the email message specifies an access function pertaining to a service and performing the access function to the service in response to the email message. Therefore the remarks stated above with respect to amended claim 1 also apply amended claim 14.

Given that claims 15-21 depend from amended claim 7, it is submitted that claims 15-21 are not anticipated by *Blair*.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the applicable rejections have been overcome.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11-15-04   By: _Paul, HA_____

Paul H. Horstmann
Reg. No.: 36,167

- 8 -